arXiv:1401.5868v1 [math.CO] 23 Jan 2014

LEVEL MATRICES

G. SEELINGER, P. SISSOKHO, L. SPENCE, AND C. VANDEN EYNDEN

Abstract. Let $n > 1$ and $k > 0$ be fixed integers. A matrix is said to be *level* if all its column sums are equal. A level matrix with m rows is called *reducible* if we can delete j rows, $0 < j < m$, so that the remaining matrix is level. We ask if there is a minimum integer $\ell = \ell(n, k)$ such that for all $m > \ell$, any $m \times n$ level matrix with entries in $\{0, \ldots, k\}$ is reducible. It is known that $\ell(2, k) = 2k - 1$. In this paper, we establish the existence of $\ell(n, k)$ for $n \geq 3$ by giving upper and lower bounds for it. We then apply this result to bound the number of certain types of vector space multipartitions.

1. Introduction

Let $n > 1$ and $k > 0$ be integers. We define a *k-matrix* to be a matrix whose entries are in $\{0, 1, 2, \ldots, k\}$. A matrix is said to be *level* if all its column sums are equal. A level matrix with m rows is called *reducible* if we can delete j rows, $0 < j < m$, so that the remaining matrix is level; otherwise it is *irreducible*. Note that if M is an irreducible matrix, then any matrix obtained from it by a permutation of rows or columns is also irreducible.

For $k = 1$ and any integer $n > 1$, the $n \times n$ identity matrix is irreducible. If $n > 4$, then we can construct an irreducible 1-matrix with n columns and $m > n$ distinct rows. Moreover, for any integers $k > 1$ and $n > 1$, we can construct an irreducible k-matrix with n columns and $m > n$ distinct rows.

In general, we do not require that irreducible k-matrices have distinct rows. We are interested in the following question.

Question. *Given integers $n > 1$ and $k > 0$, is there a minimum integer $\ell = \ell(n, k)$ such that for all $m > \ell$, any $m \times n$ level k-matrix is reducible? If $\ell(m, k)$ exists, then what can we say about its value?*

The exact value of $\ell(2, k)$ (see Theorem 1) follows from earlier work by Lambert [14]. Perhaps due to a wide range of notation and terminology in related areas, Lambert's result has been (independently) rediscovered by Diaconis et al. [6], and Sahs et al. [19]. In addition, M. Henk and R. Weismantel [13] gave improvements of Lambert's result.

Theorem 1 (Lambert [14])**.** *If $k > 1$, then $\ell(2, k) = 2k - 1$. Moreover, there are (up to row/column permutations) only two irreducible k-matrices with $2k - 1$ rows and 2 columns.*

However, to the best of our knowledge, the exact value of $\ell(n, k)$ is unknown for $n \geq 3$. In this paper, we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *Let $n \geq 3$ and $k > 0$ be integers, and let $\epsilon > 0$ be any real number. There exist infinitely infinitely many values of n for which $\ell(n,1) > e^{(1-\epsilon)\sqrt{n \ln n}}$. On the other hand,*

$$\ell(n,k) \leq \begin{cases} (2k)^3 & \text{if } n = 3, \\ k^{n-1}2^{-n}(n+1)^{(n+1)/2}\left((k+1)^n - k^n + 1\right) & \text{if } n > 3. \end{cases}$$

Let $M_{m,n}(\mathbb{Z})$ be the set of all $m \times n$ matrices with entries in $\mathbb{Z}$. In what follows, vectors are assumed to be column vectors (unless otherwise specified), and $\mathbb{Z}^n$ denotes the set of all (column) vectors with n entries from $\mathbb{Z}$. Let $A \in M_{m,n}(\mathbb{Z})$ be a k-matrix and let $\mathbf{1} = (1,\ldots,1)^T \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. We also let A_i denote the ith row of A.

For any $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^m$, we say $\vec{x}$ is a *leveler of* A if $\vec{x}$ has nonnegative entries and there exists a nonnegative $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\vec{x}^T A = \alpha \mathbf{1}^T$, or equivalently, $A^T\vec{x} = \alpha\mathbf{1}$. In particular, given a leveler $\vec{x} = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m)^T \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ of A, we can form an $(x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_m) \times n$ level k-matrix by taking x_1 copies of the first row of A, x_2 rows of the second row of A, etc. For the purposes of level k-matrices, this process will define this matrix up to a permutation of rows. In this way, each leveler represents a class of level k-matrices.

One way to classify level k-matrices then is to classify the levelers of the k-matrices A. To assist us in this analysis, we use the base field $\mathbb{Q}$ and the following notation. For any $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{Q}^m$, we write $\vec{x} \geq \vec{0}$ if $x_i \geq 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. If $\vec{x}, \vec{y} \in \mathbb{Q}^m$, we write $\vec{x} \geq \vec{y}$ if $\vec{x} - \vec{y} \geq \vec{0}$, and write $\vec{x} > \vec{y}$ if $\vec{x} \geq \vec{y}$ and $\vec{x} \neq \vec{y}$. Finally, let $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ be a leveler for A. We say $\vec{x}$ is an *irreducible* leveler if, for any leveler $\vec{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^m$, we have $\vec{x} \geq \vec{y} \Rightarrow \vec{y} = \vec{x}$ or $\vec{y} = \vec{0}$. Note that $\vec{x}$ is an irreducible leveler of A if and only if the corresponding matrix formed from A is an irreducible k-matrix.

Assume that the rows of $A \in M_{m,n}(\mathbb{Z})$ are distinct and $m \geq n$. Define

$$\mathcal{F}(A) = \{\vec{x} \in \mathbb{Q}^m \mid A^T\vec{x} = \mathbf{1} \text{ and } \vec{x} > \vec{0}\}. \tag{1}$$

Note that $\mathcal{F}(A)$ is a convex polytope in $\mathbb{Q}^m$ since it is the intersection of the linear space $\{\vec{x} \in \mathbb{Q}^m \mid A^T\vec{x} = \mathbf{1}\}$ with the half-spaces $\mathcal{H}_i = \{\vec{x} \in \mathbb{Q}^m \mid x_i \geq 0\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$.

We say that $\vec{x} \in \mathcal{F}(A)$ is a *basic feasible solution* (BSF) if there exists a set of n indices $I = \{i_1, \ldots, i_n\} \subseteq \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$ such that:

(a) $x_i = 0$ for each $i \notin I$.
(b) If C is the matrix with rows A_i for $i \in I$, then C is invertible. Thus, if $\vec{y} = C^{-1}\mathbf{1}$, then $x_{i_j} = y_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$.

Note that for any given set of n indices I, there is at most one BFS corresponding to it. We will use this property later.

Define

$$\mathcal{B}(A) = \{\vec{x} \in \mathcal{F}(A) \mid \vec{x} \text{ is a basic feasible solution in } \mathcal{F}(A)\}. \tag{2}$$

Let $\mathcal{C}(A) = \{q\vec{x} : \ q \geq 0, q \in \mathbb{Q}, \vec{x} \in \mathcal{F}(A)\}$ be the positive affine cone of $\mathcal{F}(A)$ in $\mathbb{Q}^m$. Then $\mathcal{C}(A)$ is a pointed rational cone generated by $\mathcal{B}(A)$, and $\mathcal{Z}(A) = \mathcal{C}(A) \cap \mathbb{Z}^m$ is exactly the set of levelers for A. By [17, Prop. 7.15], there exists a unique minimal

generating set of $\mathcal{Z}(A)$, which is called the *Hilbert basis* of $\mathcal{Z}(A)$. We have the following proposition.

Proposition 3. *If A is a matrix with nonnegative entries, then the Hilbert basis of $\mathcal{Z}(A)$ is the set of irreducible levelers of A.*

In Section 2, we prove our main theorem (Theorem 2) using tools from combinatorial optimization (in particular Carathéodory's Theorem). In Section 3, we apply Theorem 2 to prove some Ramsey-type statements about vector space multipartitions with respect to some irreducibility criteria that we shall define later.

2. Proof of Theorem 2

The proof of our main theorem relies on Theorem 8 in Section 2.1, Theorem 9 in Section 2.2, and Theorem 10 in Section 2.3.

2.1. The first upper bound for $\ell(n,k)$.

For any matrix A, let $\ell(A)$ denote its number of rows, and let $|A|$ denote its determinant if A is a square matrix. For any rational vector $\vec{x}$, let $\vec{x}_i$ denote its ith entry and let r_x be the smallest positive integer such that $r_x\vec{x}$ is integral, i.e., the entries of $r_x\vec{x}$ are all integers.

For any vector $\vec{x} \in \mathcal{F}(A)$ (thus, $A^T\vec{x} = \mathbf{1}$ and $\vec{x} > \vec{0}$) and any integer $r > 0$ such that $r\vec{x}$ is an integral vector, let $L(A, r, \vec{x})$ be the matrix obtained by stacking rx_i copies of A_i for $1 \le i \le m$. Note that we define $L(A, r, \vec{x})$ up to a permutation of rows.

Lemma 4. *If $A \in M_{n,n}(\mathbb{Z})$ is an invertible k-matrix and $\vec{x} \in \mathcal{F}(A)$, then $L(A, r_x, \vec{x})$ is irreducible.*

Proof. If the lemma does not hold, then there exists $\vec{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, with $\vec{0} < \vec{y} < r_x\vec{x}$, such that $A^T\vec{y}$ is level, say with column sums $t > 0$. Then $A^T\vec{y} = t\mathbf{1}$, so $A^T t^{-1}\vec{y} = \mathbf{1} = A^T\vec{x}$. Thus $t^{-1}\vec{y} = \vec{x}$. But then $t\vec{x} = \vec{y}$ is integral, so by the definition of r_x we have $t \ge r_x$. This contradicts the assumption that $\vec{y} < r_x\vec{x}$. □

A *convex combination* of the vectors $\vec{x}^{(1)}, \ldots, \vec{x}^{(t)}$ is an expression of the form

$$\lambda_1\vec{x}^{(1)} + \ldots + \lambda_t\vec{x}^{(t)} \text{ with } \lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}^+ \text{ for } 1 \le i \le t, \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^{t} \lambda_i = 1.$$

If $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{Q}^+$ for all $1 \le i \le t$, then the convex combination is called *rational*.

Lemma 5. *Let $n > 1$ and $k \ge 1$ be integers. Suppose that H is an irreducible k-matrix with n columns, at least 3 rows, and a 0-entry in each row. Then there exists a k-matrix $A = A(H)$ with n columns such that*
(i) A has rank n and $m = \frac{1}{2}\left((k+1)^n - k^n - 1\right)$ distinct rows,
(ii) $H = L(A, r_h, \vec{h})$, where $\vec{h} \in \mathcal{F}(A)$ is a rational convex combination of the BFS in $\mathcal{B}(A)$.

Proof. Let $R = (a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ be a row of H and define the complement of R to be the vector $R^c = (t - a_1, \ldots, t - a_n)$, where $t = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} a_i$. Since H is an irreducible k-matrix with at least 3 rows and a 0-entry in each row, the following conditions hold.
(C_1) $a_j = 0$ for some j, $1 \leq j \leq n$;
(C_2) R is not the zero row vector;
(C_3) R^c is not a row of H.

Note that (C_1) implies that no row of H is equal to its complement, and (C_3) does not hold if H has exactly two rows (namely R and R^c).

Let $A = A(H)$ be any k-matrix obtained by stacking together one copy of each distinct row of H and all the row vectors of length n with entries in $[0, k] = \{0, 1, \ldots, k\}$ such that the conditions (C_1)–(C_3) hold for every row vector R of A. Note that there are $(k+1)^n$ row vectors of length n with entries in $[0, k]$, k^n such row vectors that do not satisfy (C_1), and one row vector that does not satisfy (C_2). Moreover, for any two distinct row vectors R_i and R_j in A, the row vectors R_i, R_i^c, R_j, R_j^c are all distinct and satisfy (C_1) and (C_2). Thus, the number of rows of A is

$$m = \frac{1}{2}\left((k+1)^n - k^n - 1\right).$$

Furthermore, the matrix A has rank n since the linear span, $\mathcal{S}$, of its rows contains all the rows of the $n \times n$ identity matrix I_n. To see this, first note that $\mathbf{1}^T = (1, \ldots, 1) \in \mathcal{S}$ since H is a level matrix and its distinct rows are in A. Next, it follows from the definition of A that if the row e_i of I_n is not a row of A, then its complement $e_i^c = (1, \ldots, 1) - e_i$ is. Since $\mathbf{1}^T$ and e_i^c are in $\mathcal{S}$, then the linear combination $\mathbf{1}^T - e_i^c = e_i$ is also in $\mathcal{S}$. Thus, all the rows of I_n are in $\mathcal{S}$.

By definition of A, it follows that H can be obtained (up to a row permutation) by stacking some $v_i \geq 0$ copies of A_i (the ith row of A) for $1 \leq i \leq m$. Hence, the vector $\vec{v} = (v_1, \ldots, v_m)^T$ satisfies $A^T\vec{v} = t\mathbf{1}$ for some positive integer t. If we let $\vec{h} = \frac{1}{t}\vec{v}$, then $H = L(A, t, \vec{h}) = L(A, r_h, \vec{h})$, where $r_h = t$ follows from the irreducibility of H. Moreover, $A^T\vec{h} = \mathbf{1}$ and $h_i \geq 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$. Thus, $\vec{h} \in \mathcal{F}(A)$. It follows from the theory of polytopes (e.g., see [18, Theorem 2.3]) that $\vec{h}$ is a rational convex combination of the BFS in $\mathcal{B}(A)$. □

We define the *complement of a matrix* B, denoted by B^c, to be the matrix obtained by replacing each entry b of B by $t - b$, where t is the maximum entry in B.

In the next lemma, we give an upper bound on the number of rows in the matrix $L(A, r_y, \vec{y})$ for the case when A is an invertible k-matrix and $\vec{y} \in \mathcal{F}(A)$.

Lemma 6. *Let $n > 1$ and $k \geq 1$ be integers. If $A \in M_{n,n}(\mathbb{Z})$ is an invertible k-matrix, $\vec{y} \in \mathcal{F}(A)$, and $L_A = L(A, r_y, \vec{y})$, then*

$$\ell(L_A) \leq (k/2)^{n-1}(n+1)^{(n+1)/2}.$$

Proof. Since $\vec{y} \in \mathcal{F}(A)$, then $A^T\vec{y} = \mathbf{1}$. Recall that r_y is by definition the smallest positive integer such that $r_y\vec{y}$ is an integral vector. Since $|A^T| \cdot \vec{y}$ is an integral vector by Cramer's rule, it follows that $r_y \leq |A^T|$.

Since A is a k-matrix, we may assume that its largest entry is k, otherwise A is a k'-matrix with largest entry $k' < k$. By definition, $L_A = L(A, r_y, \vec{y})$ is also a k-matrix and L_A^c denotes its complement. Since L_A is irreducible by Lemma 4, then we can directly verify that L_A^c is also irreducible. Moreover, if we let A^c be the complement of A, then there exists $y' \in \mathcal{F}(A^c)$ such that $L_A^c = L_{A^c} = L(A^c, r_{y'}, \vec{y'})$, $r_{y'}\vec{y'} = r_y\vec{y}$, and $\vec{z'} = |(A^c)^T| \cdot ((A^c)^T)^{-1}\mathbf{1} = |(A^c)^T| \cdot \vec{y'}$ is an integral vector (thus, $r_{y'} \leq |(A^c)^T|$). If $\vec{w} = (a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ is the ith row vector of A^T, then $\vec{w^c} = (k - a_1, \ldots, k - a_n)$ is the ith row vector of $(A^c)^T$. Since $A^T\vec{y} = \mathbf{1}$ and $(A^c)^T\vec{y'} = \mathbf{1}$, it follows that $\vec{w} \cdot \vec{y} = 1$ and $\vec{w^c} \cdot \vec{y'} = 1$. By using these observations and $r_{y'}\vec{y'} = r_y\vec{y}$, we obtain

$$r_y + r_{y'} = \vec{w} \cdot r_y\vec{y} + \vec{w^c} \cdot r_{y'}\vec{y'} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j r_y y_j + \sum_{j=1}^{n} (k - a_j) r_y y_j = r_y k \sum_{j=1}^{n} y_j,$$

so that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} y_i = \frac{r_y + r_{y'}}{r_y k}.$$

Thus, the number of rows of L_A (or L_{A^c}) is by definition

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(L_A) = r_y \sum_{j=1}^{n} \vec{y}_j = \frac{r_y + r_{y'}}{k} &\leq \frac{|A^T| + |(A^c)^T|}{k} \\ &\leq \frac{2(k/2)^n (n+1)^{(n+1)/2}}{k} \qquad (3) \\ &= (k/2)^{n-1} (n+1)^{(n+1)/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality (3) holds since $(k/2)^n(n+1)^{(n+1)/2}$ is an upper bound for the determinant of any invertible $n \times n$ matrix in which all entries are real and the absolute value of any entry is at most k (see [3, 9]). □

To prove the main theorem in this section, we also use a theorem of Carathéodory, which we shall state after a few definitions, following the account of Ziegler [20].

Let $S = \{\vec{x}^{(1)}, \ldots, \vec{x}^{(t)}\}$ be a set of vectors from $\mathbb{R}^n$. The *affine hull* of S is

$$\mathrm{Aff}(S) = \{\lambda_1\vec{x}^{(1)} + \ldots + \lambda_t\vec{x}^{(t)} : \ \lambda_i \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^{t} \lambda_i = 1\}.$$

The *convex hull* of S, which we denote by $\mathrm{Conv}(S)$, is the set of all its convex combinations. A set I of vectors in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is *affinely independent* if every proper subset of I has a smaller affine hull. The dimension of an affine hull G is $g - 1$, where g is the cardinality

of largest affinely independent subset $I \subseteq G$. Finally, the dimension of a convex hull $\mathrm{Conv}(S)$ is the dimension of the corresponding affine hull $\mathrm{Aff}(S)$.

Theorem 7 (Carathéodory's Theorem [20])**.** *Let $S = \{\vec{x}^{(1)}, \ldots, \vec{x}^{(t)}\}$ be a set of vectors from $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\mathrm{Conv}(S)$ has dimension d. If $\vec{h} \in \mathrm{Conv}(S)$, then $\vec{h}$ is the convex combination of at most $d+1$ properly chosen vectors from S.*

We can now prove the following theorem.

Theorem 8. *Let $n > 1$ and $k > 0$ be integers. If H is an irreducible k-matrix with n columns, then*

$$\ell(H) \leq k^{n-1} 2^{-n} (n+1)^{(n+1)/2} \left((k+1)^n - k^n + 1\right).$$

Proof. Let $R = (a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ be a row of H such that $a_0 = \min_{1 \leq j \leq n} a_j$ is positive. Then it is easy to verify that the matrix H' obtained from H by replacing R with $(a_1 - a_0, \ldots, a_n - a_0)$ is also an irreducible k-matrix with the same number of rows as H. Since we are interested in bounding $\ell(n,k)$, the maximum number of rows of an irreducible k-matrix with n columns, we may assume (w.l.o.g.) that each row of H contains a 0-entry. Since the theorem holds (by inspection) if H has fewer than 3 rows, we may also assume that H has at least 3 rows.

Thus, it follows from Lemma 5 that there exists a matrix $A = A(H)$ with m rows such that $H = L(A, r_h, \vec{h})$ for some $\vec{h} \in \mathcal{F}(A)$. Moreover, there exist nonnegative rational numbers $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_t$, such that $\sum_{j=1}^t \lambda_j = 1$ and $\vec{h} = \sum_{j=1}^t \lambda_j \vec{x}^{(j)}$, where $\vec{x}^{(j)} \in \mathcal{B}(A)$. For $1 \leq j \leq t$, recall that $r_j = r_{x^{(j)}}$ is the smallest positive integer such that $r_j \vec{x}^{(j)}$ is an integral vector. Thus,

$$r_h \vec{h} = \sum_{j=1}^{t} \left(\lambda_j \frac{r_h}{r_j}\right) r_j \vec{x}^{(j)}. \tag{4}$$

If $\lambda_j \frac{r_h}{r_j} > 1$ for some j, then it follows from (4) that $r_h \vec{h} > r_j \vec{x}^{(j)}$ since $\vec{h} \neq \vec{x}^{(j)}$. This would imply that matrix $H' = L(A, r_h, \vec{h}) - L(A, r_j, \vec{x}^{(j)})$ (where the subtraction is done componentwise) is a proper level k-submatrix of $H = L(A, r_h, \vec{h})$, which contradicts the irreducibility of H. Hence, we must have $\lambda_j \frac{r_h}{r_j} \leq 1$ for all j. Then this fact and (4) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(H) = r_h \sum_{i=1}^{m} h_i &= r_h \sum_{j=1}^{t} \left(\lambda_j \sum_{i=1}^{m} \vec{x}_i^{(j)}\right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{t} \left(\lambda_j \frac{r_h}{r_j} \sum_{i=1}^{m} r_j \vec{x}_i^{(j)}\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{t} \sum_{i=1}^{m} r_j \vec{x}_i^{(j)}. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Since $\vec{x}^{(j)} \in \mathcal{B}(A)$, there exists a matrix $L_j = L(A, r_j, \vec{x}^{(j)})$ such that $\ell(L_j) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} r_j \vec{x}_i^{(j)}$ for $1 \leq j \leq t$. Moreover, it follows from Theorem 7 that $t \leq d+1$, where d is the dimension of the polytope generated by the vectors in $\mathcal{B}(A)$. Thus, it follows from (5) and the preceding observations that

$$\ell(H) \leq (d+1) \max_j \ell(L_j). \tag{6}$$

Since $\vec{x}^{(j)} \in \mathcal{B}(A)$ is a BFS, there exists a subset $I \subseteq \{1, \ldots, m\}$ of n indices such that $\vec{x}_i^{(j)} = 0$ for $i \notin I$. Let $A^{(j)}$ be the $n \times n$ matrix containing the rows A_i for each $i \in I$. Then $A^{(j)}$ is invertible and $\vec{y}^{(j)} = \left((A^{(j)})^T\right)^{-1} \mathbf{1}$ satisfies $x_i^{(j)} = x_i$ for all $i \in I$. Hence, $L_j = L(A, r_{x^{(j)}}, \vec{x}^{(j)})$ and $L'_j = L(A^{(j)}, r_{y^{(j)}}, \vec{y}^{(j)})$ are the same matrices up to a permutation of rows. Thus, it follows from Lemma 6 that

$$\ell(L_j) = \ell(L'_j) \leq (k/2)^{n-1}(n+1)^{(n+1)/2}. \tag{7}$$

Since d is at most the number of distinct of rows in A, it follows from Lemma 5 that

$$d+1 \leq \frac{(k+1)^n - k^n - 1}{2} + 1 = \frac{(k+1)^n - k^n + 1}{2}, \tag{8}$$

If now follows from (6), (8), and (7) that

$$\ell(H) \leq k^{n-1} 2^{-n} (n+1)^{(n+1)/2} \left((k+1)^n - k^n + 1\right),$$

which concludes the proof. □

2.2. **The second upper bound for $\ell(n,k)$.**

In this section, we establish another upper bound for $\ell(n,k)$ that is better than the upper bound provided by Theorem 9 for $n \in \{2,3\}$.

Theorem 9. *Let $n > 1$ and $k > 0$ be integers. If H is an irreducible k-matrix with n columns, then $\ell(H) < (2k)^{2^{n-1}-1}$.*

Proof. For convenience define $r_n = 2^{n-1} - 1$. Then $r_2 = 1$ and $r_{n+1} = 2r_n + 1$.

The proof will be by induction on $n \geq 2$, where the $n = 2$ case follows from Theorem 1. Assume the statement of the theorem holds for n, and let H be an irreducible k-matrix of size $m \times (n+1)$. Let $\widehat{H}$ be the matrix obtained from H by deleting the last column of H.

Note that if a level matrix is reducible, then its rows can be rearranged to form a stack of two level matrices, and this division can be continued until a stack of irreducible matrices is attained. Rearrange the rows of H to form a new matrix consisting of a stack of k-matrices $M^{(i)}$ of size $m_i \times (n+1)$, $1 \leq i \leq t$, such that each matrix $\widehat{M^{(i)}}$ formed by deleting the last column of $M^{(i)}$ is an irreducible matrix. For $1 \leq i \leq t$, let a_i be the common column sum of $\widehat{M^{(i)}}$, and let b_i be the sum of the entries in the last column of $M^{(i)}$. Note that for $1 \leq i \leq t$, we have $m_i \leq (2k)^{r_n}$ by the induction hypothesis. Since H is a k-matrix, both a_i and b_i cannot exceed $K = (2k)^{r_n} k$.

Let M be the K-matrix of size $t \times 2$ with ith row vector (a_i, b_i), $1 \leq i \leq t$. Since H is level, so is M. Since $m_i \leq (2k)^{r_n}$, we also have

$$m = \sum_{i=1}^{t} m_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^{t} (2k)^{r_n} = t(2k)^{r_n}.$$

Since H is irreducible, then M is also irreducible, and $t \leq 2K - 1$ by Theorem 1. Thus

$$m \leq t(2k)^{r_n} < 2K(2k)^{r_n} = 2k((2k)^{r_n})^2 = (2k)^{2r_n+1} = (2k)^{r_{n+1}}.$$

□

2.3. **The lower bound.**

In this section we construct examples of irreducible matrices, each of whose number of rows is greater than some exponential function of its number of columns.

Theorem 10. *Let $\epsilon > 0$ be any real number. There exist infinitely many irreducible 1-matrices with n columns and more than $e^{(1-\epsilon)\sqrt{n \ln n}}$ rows.*

Proof. We write $f(x) \sim g(x)$ if $\lim_{x\to\infty} f(x)/g(x) = 1$.

Let p_i denote the ith prime, and for $x \geq 2$, let $t = \pi(x)$ be the number of primes not exceeding x. Let J_r be the $r \times r$ matrix with 0's on its main diagonal and 1's everywhere else. Set $r_i = p_i + 1$, $n = n(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{t} r_i$, and consider the $n \times n$ matrix

$$A = A(x) = \begin{bmatrix} J_{r_1} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & J_{r_2} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ & & \cdots & & \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & J_{r_t} \end{bmatrix},$$

where the 0's represent zero matrices of the appropriate sizes. By repeating each row of J_{r_i} in A exactly P/p_i times, where $P = P(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{t} p_i$, we get a level matrix $A^* = A^*(x)$. Since $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_t$ are relatively prime in pairs, the matrix A^* is irreducible, and the number of columns of A^* is still n.

Let $\theta = \theta(x) = \ln\left(\prod_{i=1}^{t} p_i\right)$. The prime number theorem states that $\pi(x) \sim x/\ln x$, and this is equivalent to $\theta \sim x$ (see [1], Th. 4.4). It also follows from [15] that $\sum_{i=1}^{t} p_i \sim x^2/\ln(x^2)$, and from [1], Th. 12, that $\sum_{i=1}^{t} \frac{1}{p_i} \sim \ln\ln x$.

Now the number of rows of A^* is

$$m = m(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{t} \frac{P}{p_i}(p_i + 1).$$

Thus

$$m = P\sum_{i=1}^{t}(1 + 1/p_i) \text{ and } \ln m = \theta(x) + \ln\left(\sum_{i=1}^{t}(1 + 1/p_i)\right).$$

These relations yield $\ln m \sim x$ and $n \sim x^2/\ln(x^2)$.

Notice that $f(y) = \sqrt{y \ln y}$ is increasing for $y \geq 1$. Let y be such that $x = \sqrt{y \ln y}$, and note that $x \to \infty$ if and only if $y \to \infty$. Then $\ln m \sim x$ and $n \sim x^2/\ln(x^2)$ imply that

$$\ln m \sim \sqrt{y \ln y} \text{ and } n \sim \frac{x^2}{\ln x^2} = \frac{y \ln y}{\ln(y \ln y)} = \frac{y \ln y}{\ln y + \ln \ln y} \sim y.$$

Hence $\ln m \sim \sqrt{n \ln n}$. Thus, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an integer $n = n(x, \epsilon)$ such that $\ln m/\sqrt{n \ln n} > 1 - \epsilon$, or

$$m > e^{(1-\epsilon)\sqrt{n \ln n}}.$$

□

2.4. **Proof of Theorem 2.**

The first part Theorem 2 follows from directly from Theorem 10. The upper bound for $\ell(n, k)$ follows from Theorem 8 when $n = 3$, and from Theorem 9 when $n > 3$.

3. Application to multipartitions of finite vector spaces

Let $V = V(n, q)$, where $V(n, q)$ denotes the n-dimensional vector space over the finite field with q elements. We will consider multisets of nonzero subspaces of V such that each nonzero element of V is in the same number of subspaces, counting multiplicities. More explicitly, a *multipartition* P of V is a pair (F, α), where F is a finite set, α is a function from F to the set of nonzero subspaces of V, and there exists a positive integer λ such that whenever v is a nonzero elements of V we have

$$|\{f \in F : \ v \in \alpha(f)\}| = \lambda.$$

In this case, we call P a λ-*partition*.

A number of papers have been written about 1-partitions, usually just called "partitions", (e.g., see [2, 4, 7, 10, 16] and [11] for a survey), and at least one about multipartitions ([8]). A general question in this area is to classify the multipartitions of V.

If V has a λ-partition P and a μ-partition Q, then a $(\lambda + \mu)$-partition of V may be formed by combining P and Q in the obvious way. We denote this by $P+Q$. Conversely, it may be possible to break a multipartition into smaller multipartitions. Thus, it is of interest to investigate multipartitions that cannot be broken up any further. We call a multipartition P of V *irreducible* if there do not exist multipartitions Q_1 and Q_2 of V such that $P = Q_1 + Q_2$. Clearly any multipartition of V can be written as a sum of irreducible multipartitions of V.

Let S be a set. Call (F, α) a *level family* of S if α is a function from F into $2^S \backslash \{\emptyset\}$ for which there exists a positive integer λ such that if $x \in S$, then $|\{f \in F : \ \alpha(f) = x\}| = \lambda$. We call λ the *height* of the family. Call the level family (F, α) with height λ *reducible* if there exists a subset F' of F and an integer λ', $0 < \lambda' < \lambda$, such that $(F', \alpha|_{F'})$ is a level family of S with height λ'; otherwise call (F, α) *irreducible*.

Corollary 11. *If S has $n \geq 2$ elements and (F, α) is an irreducible family of S, then*

$$|F| \leq (n+1)^{(n+1)/2}.$$

Thus, a finite set S has only finitely-many irreducible families.

Proof. Let $s_1, \ldots, s_n$ be the distinct elements of S, and let $f_1, \ldots, f_m$ be the distinct elements of F. Define the 1-matrix B with entries $b_{1,1}, \ldots, b_{m,n}$ by letting $b_{ij} = 1$ if $s_j \in \alpha(f_i)$, and $b_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. By the definition of an irreducible family all the column sums of B are equal, and B is an irreducible matrix. Then by setting $k = 1$ in Theorem 2, we obtain $|F| = m \leq (n+1)^{(n+1)/2}$. □

Corollary 12. *If (F, α) be an irreducible λ-partition of $V(n, q)$ for some integer λ, then*

$$|F| \leq q^{(n-1)q^{n-1}/2}.$$

Thus, $V(n, q)$ has finitely–many irreducible λ-partitions.

Proof. Let $W_1, \ldots, W_t$ be the distinct 1-dimensional subspaces of $V(n, q)$, where $t = (q^n - 1)/(q - 1)$, and let $f_1, \ldots, f_m$ be the distinct elements of F. Define the 1-matrix B with entries $b_{1,1}, \ldots, b_{m,t}$ by letting $b_{ij} = 1$ if $W_j \subseteq \alpha(f_i)$ and $b_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. Then all the column sums of B are λ, and B is an irreducible matrix. Since $t + 1 = q^{n-1}$, setting $k = 1$ in Theorem 2 yields

$$|F| = m \leq (t+1)^{(t+1)/2} = q^{(n-1)q^{n-1}/2}.$$

□

4. Conclusion

Our main question (see page 1) is still open in general. For example, if $A \in M_{m,n}(\mathbb{Z})$ is a k-matrix such that $A^T \vec{x} = \mathbf{1}$ for some $\vec{x} > \vec{0}$, then we know by Lemma 6 that the number of rows, $\ell(L_A)$, of the irreducible matrix $L_A = L(A, r_x, \vec{x})$ satisfies $\ell(L_A) \leq (k/2)^{n-1}(n+1)^{(n+1)/2}$. However, the small cases that we have checked suggest that $\ell(L_A)$ is much smaller. It would be interesting to find the exact value of $\ell(L_A)$ or improve its upper bound. Such an improvement would also give a better upper bound for the general value of $\ell(n, k)$ in Theorem 2.

In Proposition 3, we characterized the set $\mathcal{Z}(A)$ of levelers of a given matrix by a cone whose Hilbert basis is the set of irreducible levelers $\mathcal{I}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(A)$. It would be interesting to investigate if this characterization can shed more light on the study of Hilbert bases (e.g., see [5, 12]) in certain cases.

Acknowledgement: The authors thank S. Tipnis for suggesting the connection to polyhedral cones.

References

[1] T. Apostol, Introduction to Analytic Number Theory, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1976.

[2] A. Beutelspacher, Partial spreads in finite projective spaces and partial designs, *Math. Z.* **145** (1975), 211–229.

[3] J. Brenner and L. Cummings, The Hadamard maximum determinant problem, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **79** (1972), 626–630.

[4] T. Bu, Partitions of a vector space, *Discrete Math.* **31** (1980), 79–83.

[5] W. Cook, J. Fonlupt, and A. Schrijver, An integer analogue of Carathéodory's Theorem, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, **40** (1976), 63–70.

[6] P. Diaconis, R. Graham, and B. Sturmfels, Primitive partition identities, *Paul Erdos is 80, Vol. II, Janos Bolyai Society*, Budapest, 1-20, 1995.

[7] S. El-Zanati, G. Seelinger, P. Sissokho, L. Spence, and C. Vanden Eynden, Partitions of finite vector spaces into subspaces, *J. Combin. Des.* **16(4)** (2008), 329–341.

[8] S. El-Zanati, G. Seelinger, P. Sissokho, L. Spence, and C. Vanden Eynden, On Lambda-fold Partitions of Finite Vector Spaces and Duality, *Discrete Math.* **311/4** (2011), 307–318.

[9] D. Faddeev and I. Sominskii, Problems in Higher Algebra, W. H. Freeman, San Francisco, 1965.

[10] O. Heden, Necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of a class of partitions of a finite vector space, *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* **53** (2009), 69–73.

[11] O. Heden, A survey of the different types of vector space partitions, *Discrete Math. Algorithms Appl.* **4** (2012), 14 pp.

[12] M. Henk and R. Weismantel, The height of minimal Hilbert bases, *Results Math.* **32** (1997), 298–303.

[13] M. Henk and R. Weismantel, on minimal solutions of linear diophantine equations, *Contrib. Algebra Geom.* **41(1)**, (2000), 49–55.

[14] J. Lambert, Une borne pour les générateurs des solutions entières positives d'une équation diophantienne linéaire, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser.I Math.* **305** (1987), 39–40.

[15] E. Landau, *Handbuch der Lehre von der Verteilung der Primzahlen, Band* **1**, p. 226, Teubner, Leipzig, 1953.

[16] B. Lindström, Group partitions and mixed perfect codes, *Canad. Math. Bull.* **18** (1975), 57–60.

[17] E. Miller and B. Sturmfels, Combinatorial Commutative Algebra, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2005.

[18] C. Papadimitriou, K. Steiglitz, Combinatorial Optimization: Algorithms and Complexity, Dover Publications, New York, 1998.

[19] M. Sahs, P. Sissokho, and J. Torf, A zero-sum theorem over $\mathbb{Z}$, *Integers* **13**, #A70 (2013) (electronic).

[20] G. Ziegler, Lectures on Polytopes, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.

Mathematics Department, Illinois State University, Campus Box 4520, Stevenson Hall 313, Normal, IL 61790-4520

E-mail address: {gfseeli|psissok|spence|cve}@ilstu.edu